

Remarks

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they did not include item 38 mentioned in the description. Applicants amended the description to delete this reference.

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed November 21, 2001 as containing new matter. Applicants amended the description to remove the language in question.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 15/1, 16, 21-25, 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by 4,716,664 ("Taylor") and claims 1-40 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by 5,901,467 ("Peterson"). Based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 40, the only independent claims in the case, relate to a shoe having a removably mounted heel surface and where the heel surface requires a horseshoe-shape surface for engaging upon a bowling alley and a center region surface connecting at least two localized areas of the horseshoe-shape surface together. Applicants' removably mounted heel permits the heel surface to be interchanged to vary the effects of friction between the shoe and the bowling alley. Because neither Taylor nor Peterson discloses, teaches, or suggests a removably mounted heel surface or a center region surface connecting at least two localized areas of the horseshoe-shape surface together, neither reference anticipates Applicants' invention.

Taylor shows a horseshoe-shape heel but the heel is not removably mounted and cannot permit a user to interchange the heel with other heels to vary the effects of friction between the shoe and the bowling alley.

Peterson shows a horseshoe-shape heel but the heel is also not removably mounted and cannot permit a user to interchange the heel with other heels to vary the effects of friction between the shoe and the bowling alley. Moreover, Peterson does not include a center region surface connecting at least two localized areas of the horseshoe-shape surface together. Applicants' center region provides structural integrity to the heel surface such that the heel surface may be interchanged with a reduced tendency to warp or bend. This center region is not in Peterson and, even if Peterson showed a removably heel, the heel would be structurally weak and have a tendency to warp due to the absence of the center region connecting at least two localized areas of the horseshoe-shape surface together.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that all claims are in order for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David Chen, Registration No. 46,613
Gene S. Winter, Registration No. 28,352
Attorneys for Applicants
ST.ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, CT 06905-5619
203 324-6155